

REMARKS

Claims 18-25 and 41-48 are now pending in the application. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to applicant's representative during a telephone interview on July 24, 2006. Arguments made by the applicant's representative during the interview are set forth below. Although agreement was not reached at that time, applicant believes these arguments overcome the Examiner's rejections. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 18, 19, 22-24, 41 and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over U.S. Patent No. 6,300,988 (Ishihara) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,872,973 (Koyama). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ishihara is directed generally to a liquid crystal display device. With reference to Figure 6, the Examiner interprets insulating film 506 to be the interlayer-insulating film as recited in previously presented claims. However, the active layer (i.e., organic film 508) is not between the gate 502 and the insulating film 506 as recited in the previously presented claims. Koyama is relied upon for a different aspect of the previously presented claims. Therefore, the previously presented claims define over this combination of references as interpreted by the Examiner.

Nonetheless, Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly define features of the invention. Of note, Claim 18 recites "the active layer being disposed between the gate of the organic thin-film transistor and either the source electrode or the drain

electrode” in combination with other elements of the claim. During the interview, the Examiner asserts the channel region 507 as disclosed in Ishihara is an active layer as recited in Applicant’s claimed invention. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that the channel region 507 is disposed between the gate electrode 502 and the source electrode 504 or the drain electrode 505. However, the channel region 507 is positioned above the gate electrode 502 and adjacent to the source electrode 504 and the drain electrode 505. Thus, the channel region is not between the gate electrode and either the source electrode or drain electrode as recited in Claim 18. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 18 as amended continues to define patentable subject matter over this combination of references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 9, 2006

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGs//BEW/TDM/drl